**Stantonbury Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting**

**Monday 12th December 2016 at 7.00pm in**

**Stantonbury Parish Offices**

**Meeting 8**

**Present:**

Richard Wilde – Cllr

Graham Davison – Cllr

Gordon Lewis

Sandra Kennedy - Cllr

John Mountford

Lisa Emmanuel – Project Officer

David Kent

Valerie Nunn

Helen Nicholson – Stanton School

Pete Lindsay – Stanton School

Jon Adamson – Stantonbury Campus

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Apologies**  Geoff Parker – Cllr  Linda Morgan – Cllr  Peter Kirkham – Cllr  David Outram – Cllr  As there were new persons present, introductions were made.  **2. Minutes from last meeting (17/10/16)**.  The minutes of the last meeting were accepted.  The question was asked why the names of resident members of the group were not disclosed. Discussion followed with regard the legalities of disclosure and the need for permissions.  GD and SK were of the understanding that as a Parish Council, under data protection laws, residents could not be disclosed, but that record of attendance was held separately.  The majority of those present were willing to give permission for their names to be disclosed on record, subject to the governance process being clarified with the Parish Clerk. | **Action**  **LE/HM** |
| **3. RevisedTerms of Reference.**  LE outlined that the Terms of Reference had been revised to reflect the changes in role for the Steering Group. However, the draft has yet to be ratified at the next Main Meeting of SPC, which is due to take place in the first week of January.  It was agreed that LE would circulate the draft and all comments would be welcomed. | **Action**  **LE** |
| **4. Stage 2 survey draft questions.**  LE explained how the Stage 1 survey data had been reviewed, ensuring the information was a true reflection of responses received and incorporated both online and hard copy responses.  This data had then been utilised to focus the Stage 2 questions on the issues of most importance to residents and also those which they had reported as the poorest performing.  It was acknowledged that more time to reflect on the questions was required, however the group went through the sections and the following comments were made:   * Concern that too many fields may discourage people from completing * Phraseology needs to reflect a clear meaning of what is required * Incentive in the form of several smaller amounts of £50 rather than one overall raffle winner * The Young People’s survey should also have the prize of £50 * The reward for the children in the lower schools will be agreed when LE meets with HN/PL but may be in the form of a monetary prize for the school, with the choice being made by the student council * Concern that some questions may be leading and will raise expectations   Discussion followed on how a Neighbourhood Plan can allocate “space” for future infrastructure, which can safeguard opportunities for the future as/when finance to provide is found.  Further discussion focussed on service provision and whether a Plan can influence budgetary spend, for instance with regard health services. It was clarified that the evidence provided through the process can only influence alongside ensuring land use accounts for potential expansion/new infrastructure.  The issue of HiMO’s was raised and the effect they can have on an area. LE explained that a policy on HiMO’s would certainly be a possibility and would be looked at during the next phase of “issues and options” following the analysis of the Stage 2 survey.  LE went on to outline the plan for distribution will include online, hard copies to all households, reply-paid envelopes along with several drop-off points for returns.  It was suggested that hard copies of the surveys were also made available in Dr’s surgeries, the Leisure Centre and the Church. LE to establish who would be willing to display.  It was agreed that LE would circulate the draft questions immediately and all members to feed back any comments by close of play Friday 23rd December.  LE then outlined the need for the Vision, Aims and Objectives to be agreed which would then be used on the introductory page to the questionnaire. RW requested the date be amended to reflect the Plan would be in place until 2031. Discussion followed, any further amendments to be feedback by the 23rd December also. | **LE/HN/PL**  **LE**  **LE/ALL**  **LE/ALL** |
| **5. Update on progress from Project Manager**  LE outlined that the data analysis and draft questionnaire had taken a large part of her time. However, progress was being made with regard land ownership, in particular having clarified all land within the parish owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership (MKDP).  Discussion followed with regard the land owned by MKC and LE confirmed that there is still a need to map all land and awaits an AO size map of the parish to continue the process.  It is hoped that a map will be produced for the next meeting for progress to be shared.  Contact has also been made with Thames Valley Police (TVP) and a meeting will be arranged for the New Year with the new Inspector.  GD updated the group on recent changes within TVP which will see the return to a focus on neighbourhood policing, despite there only being two policing areas within MK going forward. | **LE** |
| **6. Finances.**  LE informed the group that the Expression of Interest has been submitted to Locality, once this has been reviewed and acknowledged, LE can submit the full application which is intended to cover the costs relating to the design, delivery and analysis of the Stage 2 survey.  Depending on when the response is received from Locality will depict the timeline for the survey. It is intended that this will go out by mid-February, all being well. | **Lisa/Office** |
| **7. Future meeting dates**  The following dates were agreed:  Monday 16th January 2017, 7pm  Monday 27th March 2017, 7pm |  |
| **8. Any Other Business**  There being no further business, the meeting ended at 20.30pm. |  |